MAR 19 19
ALEXANDER L. ST
CLERK

No.80- 1352

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1980

Sarah D. Bollotin,

Petitioner,

vs.

Kaufman, Taylor, Kimmel & Miller and STANLEY L. KAUFMAN, ALLAN K. PECKEL, RICHARD M. ROSENBERG, RUTH LEWINSON, DOE I-VI and "BOE" BOTNICK and "MOE" KALLENECK,

Respondents.

REPLY TO RESPONDENTS BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Sarah D. Bollotin,
Petitioner, Pro Se,
310 Riverside Drive
Apt. 1202
New York, N.Y. 10025

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

NO. 80-1352

SARAH D. BOLLOTIN,

Petitioner,

vs.

KAUFMAN, TAYLOR, KIMMEL & MILLER and STANLEY L. KAUFMAN, ALLAN K. PECKEL, RICHARD M. ROSENBERG, RUTH LEWINSON, DOE I-VI and "MOE" BOTNICK and "MOE" KALLENECK,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

REPLY TO RESPONDENTS BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner's Reply To Respondents, Except Doe, Boe & Moe, In Opposition To Petition For A Writ of Certiorari must be very brief because her time in which to reply has run out.

Petitioner wanted to serve only one Reply Brief (herein) upon all of her adversaries. Petitioner served all legal papers upon the Respondents of record. Upon calling the U.S. Assistant Attorney to ask for his Reply Brief, Petitioner learned that he could no longer

handle the case since the U. S. Solicitor-General must do so. After innumerable telephone calls and letters, the U.S. Solicitor-General has waived the right to reply as to the Federal Clerks sued herein on the grounds of conspiracy to obstruct justice. The Opinion of the U.S. District Court Judge is obviously in error (Appendix 2a) since the Clerks were served. If it were only for this reason the case should be remanded to the lower Courts.

Because Petitioner tried to play fair with all parties she is now threatened with an overnight deadline.

The blunt question is: Can an attorney deliberately, knowingly and wilfully file a false instrument in the U. S. District Court and thereafter argue said false and untrue Second Amended Complaint and mislead petitioner to commit perjury against herself. Petitioner challenged the earlier District Court Decision on these grounds.

Petitioner now realizes that her opponents constitute a powerful clubhouse of lawyers and their retinue and that the lower courts rule on the status of the parties rather than on the merits of the cause.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner has been subjected to constant, unremitting, vicious, harassment, intimidation and obstruction.

This case cries out for exercise of this Honorable Court's supervisory responsibility. The lower courts have failed to in their duty.

Petitioner has always honored and respected our United States Constitution and all of our laws and prays that Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari will be granted so that equal justice under the law will prevail.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah D. Bollotin

Sarah D. Bollotin,
Petitioner, Pro Se,
310 Riverside Drive
Apt. 1202
New York, N.Y. 10025